DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 014 HE 004 908

AUTHOR	Davis, F. Mark
TITLE	Tenure Policies and Procedures of the Minnesota Private Colleges: A Tentative Response to the Report and Recommendations of the National Commission on Academic Tenure.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	28p.; Paper prepared for the American Council on Education Academic Administration Internship Program
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; *Higher Education; *Private Colleges; Surveys; *Teacher Employment; *Teacher Welfare; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Academic administrators from sixteen private colleges in Minnesota and nine chapter presidents of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) responded to a questionnaire investigating tenure policies and procedures in Minnesota private colleges. Results of the survey indicated that the private colleges of Minnesota will probably endorse many of the recommendations suggested by the National Commission on Tenure. Additionally, college administrators and campus faculty leadership may allow the development of a new faculty employment position that would offer greater job security than a probationary position and greater flexibility than a tenured position. (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085014

TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE MINNESOTA PRIVATE COLLEGES: A TENTATIVE RESPONSE TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC TENURE

by

F. MARK DAVIS
FELLOW
American Council on Education
Academic Administration Internship Program
Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

1972-1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 908

TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE MINNESOTA PRIVATE COLLEGES: A TENTATIVE RESPONSE TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC TENURE

An Introductory Consideration

This study is advisedly called "tentative." When the study was selected in the fall of 1972, the report of the National Commission on Academic Tenure[1] was scheduled for release in early January 1973. At the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges in San Franciso in January 1973, Dr. William R. Keast, Chairman of the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, reported some of the preliminary recommendations of the Commission.[2] He also announced that the full text of the Commission's report and recommendations would not be published until the later part of March. In the January 22, 1973, issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education a few, significant recommendations of the Commission were published. In the March 26, 1973, issue of the Chronicle a skeletal outline covering forty-seven specific recommendations was reported.

From this sketchy information a questionnaire (Attachment A) was prepared to be sent to the academic administrators of the

---

[1] William R. Keast, et al., Faculty Tenure (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers), 1973.

[2] William R. Keast, "The Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education: A Preview of the Report." A Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges, January 15, 1973, San Francisco Hilton Hotel.

sixteen private colleges of Minnesota (the member colleges of the Minnesota Private College Council). A shorter version of the questionnaire (Attachment B) was sent to the presidents of the local chapters of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) of the sixteen colleges.

Of the thirty-two questionnaires twenty-two were returned: thirteen from the academic administrators and nine from the AAUP presidents. (Four additional questionnaires were returned from campuses which have no AAUP chapter.) The thirteen responding academic administrators represent institutions with a total teaching faculty of 1, 364 and a student enrollment of 21,309. The three not responding represent institutions with a total student enrollment of 3,139.

Minnesota has no large private college or university. The largest of its private colleges has an enrollment of 2,546. Of the sixteen private colleges to whom the questionnaire were sent, seven are Roman Catholic in origin; nine are Protestant. Of the nine Protestant colleges, five are Lutheran in affiliation. Three of the Protestant colleges have, in recent years, severed their affiliations with church bodies. By and large the private colleges of Minnesota are regional in their efforts and appeals. Three of the sixteen have acheived national stature.

Tenure and Higher Education in Minnesota

Higher education in Minnesota, as in the entire nation, has

in the 1970's entered upon a new and different era. Given a messanic role in the 1960's, higher education struggled with the problems of rapid expansion and economic affluence. The decade of the seventies, however, has brought dramatically different problems: consolidation, retrenchment, cutbacks. There are many reasons for this turnabout. Robert Nisbet, writing in the April 1973 issue of Change suggests perhaps the major one: "Higher education's long favored status in the minds of citizens and legislators is slowly being displaced by other interests and goals."[3]

One of the problems compounding and complicating the realignment and retrenchment of the seventies is academic tenure. In Minnesota the problems of academic tenure have emerged in a variety of ways.

With the 1973-74 academic year, tenure will no longer be recognized by the Minnesota Junior College system. Contractual agreements will seek to provide job security and academic freedom.

In the fall quarter of 1972-1973, the University of Minnesota Senate considered a faculty committee's recommendations on the tenure code at the University. Among the recommendations were provisions spelling out specific conditions under which tenured faculty could be dismissed. After lengthy and sometimes

---

[3]Robert Nisbet, "The Future of Tenure," Change, 5:3 (April 1973), 27.

bitter debate, the University Senate rejected the tenure modification provisions.[4]

In the Minnesota State College system, tenure poses another serious problem. More than any other segment of the higher education system in Minnesota, the state colleges have experienced the greatest decline in student enrollment. (A 10% drop is projected for 1973-1974.) The number of faculty positions, tied largely to enrollment, will decline by 174 for 1973-1974 (out of a total number of 1900 positions).[5] The largest of the state colleges will lose 78 faculty positions (12% of the 1972-1973 faculty). The newest and one of the most innovative will lose 70 positions (35% of the 1972-1973 faculty). In most instances the 174 positions to be cut are from the non-tenured ranks. Many of these are young, aggressive, and highly qualified teaching faculty. With the release of these faculty, many students as well as many of the general public will renew the argument that tenure "shelters lazy and uncreative professors, disregards the needs of students, stands in the way of educational innovation, and keeps academic jobs for middle-aged white men".[6] With the announced

---

[4]"Controversial Tenure Provision Voted Down in Faculty Senate," University Report: A Newsletter for Staff Members on All Campuses of the University of Minnesota (January 1, 1973), p. 3.

[5]John Carman, "An Ax Falls in Groves of Academe," Minneapolis Star, section 1, February 19, 1973, p. 1

[6]Maureen Smith, "Tenure Attacked, Defended," University Report (January 1, 1973), p. 1.

cutbacks, one of the state colleges reportedly will have no faculty member in the physics department who can operate the college cyclotron.

Another dilemma of the cutbacks is the problem of women and minorities. In an attempt to meet federal guidelines, the state colleges have recently increased the recruitment of women and minorities. Many of these are among the ranks of the non-tenured. Consequently they are among the first to go.

Tenure and the Private Colleges of Minnesota

The economic and enrollment crisis faced by public higher education in 1972-1973 came earlier for the private colleges of Minnesota. Enrollment declines and faculty cutbacks began for several of the private institutions in the 1969-1970 academic year. By 1972-1973 the private college faculty positions had acheived a measure of stability and enrollment had increased slightly (2%). Tenure posed a new problem for the private colleges: Overtenure.

For several decades tenure has been an expected reward in the private college community. It has frequently been conferred, with little serious consideration, upon the superior, the average, and the below average faculty who patiently and faithfully serve the prescribed probationary years. Only the occasional outspoken misfit or the glaringly incompetent was denied. Tenure and rapid promotion were tacitly viewed as compensation for lower salaries

and lesser benefits.

In an effort to deal seriously with the new problems posed by tenure for the private colleges in Minnesota, a questionnaire was prepared and circulated to the chief academic administrators of the state's sixteen private colleges. In addition, questionnaires were sent to the presidents of the local AAUP chapters of the sixteen private colleges. The questionnaire attempted to analyze the present state of tenure in the private colleges of Minnesota. It also sought to anticipate the responses of the private colleges to the recommendations of the National Commission on tenure.

In the thirteen colleges responding to the questionnaire there are a total of 1,364 faculty having a full-time appointment and having at least a half-time teaching assignment. Of the 1,364 faculty 781 (56%) were tenured as of October 1, 1972. Ranked in percentile groupings the institutions and tenured faculty appear as follows:

> Three colleges have 70% or more of their faculty tenured;
> Two colleges have 60% or more of their faculty tenured;
> Five colleges have 50% or more of their faculty tenured;
> Two colleges have 40% or more of their faculty tenured;
> One college has 26% of its faculty tenured.[7]

If the precentage of tenured faculty recommended by the

---

[7]The last college (26% tenured faculty) apparently began awarding tenure only in the past three years. Nineteen of the twenty tenured faculty have received tenure since 1970.

National Commission (50% to 66 2/3%)[8] is to be given serious credence by the private colleges of Minnesota, three of the responding colleges face immediate problems. For two the problem is pending. And for five the problem is within three years unless measures are undertaken to limit tenure. For ten of the responding colleges the percentage of tenured faculty poses serious problems.

Related to the problem of the percentage of tenured faculty, the questionnaire attempted to determine the rate of increase of tenured faculty during the past three years. (See Attachment A, question 14.) Over the past three years approximately 161 candidates have been considered for tenure in eleven of the thirteen responding colleges. (Two did not respond to this question.) Approximately 40 of the 161 candidates were not granted tenure. Clearly with seventy-five percent of the candidates receiving tenure, a "tenured-in" faculty(90% to 100% tenured) appears an increasing probability unless immediate and rigorous efforts to restrict tenure are undertaken.[9]

---

[8]Specifically on the issue of percentages of tenured faculty, the Commission declared: "In the commission's nearly unanimous judgement, it will probably be dangerous for most institutions if tenured faculty constitute more than one half of two thirds of the total full-time faculty during the decade ahead!" Faculty Tenure, p. 50

[9]Even the college with the lowest percentage of tenured faculty must consider the pace of its tenure decisions. During the past three years nineteen candidates have received tenure. No candidate has been denied tenure. Continuing at this rate, this institution within five years will have 66.25% of its faculty tenured.

It would appear from the reponses to the questionnaire that both administrators and faculty are giving attention to the concept of a quota system for tenured appointments. (See Attachment A, question 11.) Of the thirteen academic administrators, nine favor a quota system. Three do not, and one did not respond. Of the nine repsonding AAUP chapter presidents, five do not favor a quota system; four do.[10]

The nine academic administrators who favor a quota system suggest quotas ranging from 50% to 80%. (See Attachment A, Question 4.) Generally they chose a percentage a few points above the percentage of tenured faculty currently on their campuses.[11] The four chapter presidents suggested quotas of 50% (1), 60% (1), and 66 2/3% (2).

The administrators and chapter presidents who reject a quota system were asked if they foresaw the time when their faculty would be tenured-in. Two of the administrators foresaw such a time. One did not. One declined to predict. Of the five chapter presidents, two foresaw a tenured-in faculty; three were uncertain.

As for special problems a tenured-in faculty would present, both those who favor a quota system and those who reject it re-

---

[10]One chapter president reported that his campus chapter had "explicitly rejected" a quota system last year.

[11]An exact breakdown of the suggested percentages reveals: 80% (1), 75% (2), 66 2/3% (2), 50% (2).

sponded. Problems they would anticipate include:

1. The need for periodic injections of new ideas and new programs.
2. The need for a balanced distribution of ages.
3. The need for flexibility as academic disciplines and student interests and career opportunities change.
4. The need for flexibility if and when religious faculty increase and the need for lay faculty decreases.

Question thirteen (Attachment A) presented the response of one private college to the problems of a quota system. Union College of New York, while accepting a quota system, will allow promising young faculty to continue beyond the seven year probationary period on short term contracts until a "tenure slot" opens.[12] At present the plan has drawn objections from the national office of the AAUP, but thus far the national office has not censured Union for its plan.

Minnesota private college administrators and AAUP chapter presidents were asked whether or not they would favor such a "holding pattern" for their institutions. Of the thirteen academic administrators nine would favor such a plan; two would not; and one observed that "the difference between this and tenure is verbal metaphysics," and one administrator did not respond. Interestingly, the three administrators who do not favor a quota system would favor the Union plan.) Of the nine chapter presidents, eight (a number of them with mixed feelings) would favor such a plan; one would not. (One president responded: "If (the college) did adopt

---

[12]Larry Van Dyne, "A Small College's Plan to Curb Tenure Touches Sensitive Nerves," The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 12, 1973, p.7.

a quota system, I then would favor a 'holding pattern.' It would be called purgatory, a place of punishment, but less than hell (dismissal) until elevation to heaven (tenure)."

The National Commission on Tenure also made a recommendation on administrators holding faculty tenure. "Faculty members serving full-time in administrative positions should retain their faculty tenure up to a stated maximum period (say ten years)."[13] Of the responding institutions, seven have a total of forty administrators who hold faculty tenure. (See Attachment A, question 3.) An analysis of the responses reveals the following:

One institution with 12 administrators holding faculty tenure;
One institution with 8 administrators holding faculty tenure;
One institution with 7 administrators holding faculty tenure;
One institution with 4 administrators holding faculty tenure;
Three insitutions with 3 administrators holding faculty tenure.

At present the private colleges apparently have not considered their policies concerning administrators with faculty tenure.[14]

The National Commission recommends that "institutions consider modifying their tenure arrangements in order to permit part-time faculty service under appropriate conditions to be credited

---

[13]. Faculty Tenure, p.83

[14]In addition six of the Minnesota private colleges have librarians with tenured appointments.

toward the award of tenure."[15] Of the responding institutions, only one has granted tenure to teaching faculty on a part-time appointment (part-time from initial appointment). (See Attachment A, question 4.) At this institution, however, the tenure of a part-time appointment is unique. The part-time appointment is a husband and wife team who make up a full-time appointment. While almost no part-time appointments have been granted tenure considerations at Minnesota private colleges, those full-time faculty with tenure who move to a part-time position (Attachment A, question 5) fare better. The National Commission recommends that insitutions "permit tenure positions to be held by faculty members who for family or other appropriate reasons cannot serve on a full time basis."[16] Of the responding institutions such faculty would retain tenure at nine; at two they would not; at one the question has not arisen.

In the questionnaires to both administrators and chapter presidents a number of questions were raised regarding the tenuring process at Minnesota private colleges. The responses would appear to indicate that the process is not entirely uniform nor clear. A number of the responses indicated that the process is under review. (One administrator who did not respond to the questionnaire sent a short note explaining that tenure policies

---

[15] Faculty Tenure, p. 81.

[16] Ibid.

and procedures at the institution were being evaluated by a faculty committee.)

In responding to the question whether or not tenure procedures were clearly specified to new faculty at the time of hiring (Attachment A, question 8),[17] ten academic administrators said they were clearly specified; one said they were not. One reported that the policy "has been revised during this past year - from now it will be clearly specified." Interestingly, question eight asked that a copy of the tenure policy be included with the returned questionnaire. Of the ten reporting a clearly specified policy, six sent a copy. Of the chapter presidents responding, seven reported that the tenure policies were clearly specified at the time of hiring; two reported they were not.

Questions six and seven (Attachment A) dealt with the maximum and minimum number of years that a faculty member may hold a probationary appointment. At nine of the responding institu-

---

[17] The National Commission recommends that "each institution develop and systematically use a plan for communicating its personnel policies to its faculty and give special attention to new appointees. The terms and conditions of service should be clearly spelled out. The institution's formal policy statement should be provided in convenient form and responsible officers should be assigned to insure that it is distributed and understood. For each new appointee, the specific criteria that will be used in evaluating performance during the probationary period and the procedures by which these will be applied, should be explained in writing. The communication should make as clear as possible what the chances for award of tenure are, and how far they depend upon the specialized needs of departments, available funding, institutional policy on the proportion of tenured faculty, etc. "Faculty Tenure, pp. 56-57.

tions the number of years conforms with the AAUP's maximum of seven years. At four of the institutions the maximum years were less. The minimum number of years varied with the institution as well as with the rank at appointment, ranging from no probationary period (especially at the rank of full professor) to seven years.

At Minnesota private colleges those who participate in the evaluation process for tenure decisions vary greatly. (See Attachment A, question 9.) The National Commission recommends that "each institution develop reliable procedures for review of departmental personnel recommendations above the department level. These should involve faculty from outside the department concerned."[18] The Commission further recommends that "institutional procedures for the assessment of teaching effectiveness include an explicit and formal role for students....If student evaluation is to be useful, each institution must develop means to ensure that student opinion of teaching effectiveness is in fact consistently given serious weight in decisions about reappointment, nonreappointment, the award of tenure, and subsequent personnel action. Each institution should evolve ways to enable students to see that their assessments have been taken into account."[19] An evaluation of the responses from both administrators and chapter presidents reveals one individual who consistently ranks very high in the tenure evaluation process. At

---

[18] Faculty Tenure, p. 61

[19] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

all responding institutions the department chairman was of great significance. The chairman was followed in order of significance by the academic dean; followed in turn by the president. Generally departmental peers and interdepartmental peers were of some significance. Students, primarily enrollees in the particular faculty's classes and majors in the particular faculty's discipline, ranged from some to little significance in the evaluation process. It would appear that the entire evaluation procedure for tenure appointments at Minnesota private colleges needs careful study. Standards and procedures need to be explicitly stated, the role of administrators, faculty, and students needs to be clearly defined.

Finally, outside consultants were of almost no significance in the evaluation process. It would seem that Minnesota private colleges might well be encouraged to seek outside assistance in the tenure process. Colleges might exchange faculty to make up examining committees; church bodies have boards of higher education that might assist; alumni might also be asked to participate. Generally, the public at large does not understand academic tenure. Some of the lack of understanding as well as some of the misunderstanding concerning tenure might well be eliminated by involving the public in the evaluation process.

By and large there is general agreement among the responding administrators as to the most important factors that determine tenure appointments (Attachment A, question 10). Two factors--teaching competence and the ability to interact successfully with students--ranked highest. The factors, listed in

descending order of significance, are:

(A score of 12 indicates the highest possible ranking.)

1. Teaching competence	(12)
2. Interact with students	(13)
3. Interact with faculty	(18)
4. Commitment to goals of college	(18)
5. Academic degree	(20)
6. Interact with administrators	(23)
7. Research competence	(25)
8. Community service role	(26)
9. Publication record	(27)
10. Religious commitment	(30)

One other factor was added by two administrators: committee and other campus involvement.

The nine chapter presidents responded to the same question. Their perceptions of the significance of factors determining tenure appointments were somewhat different. Like the administrators they saw teaching competence as of the highest significance. Their ranking of the factors are:

(A score of 9 indicates the highest possible significance.)

1. Teaching competence	(12)
2. Interact with faculty	(14)
3. Interact with students	(16)
4. Interact with administrators	(16)
5. Academic degree	(17)
6. Commitment to goals of the college	(17)
7. Community service role	(24)
8. Religious commitment	(25)
9. Research competence	(26)
10. Publication record	(26)

The National Commission recommends that "the award of tenure always be based on an explicit judgment of qualifications, resulting from continuous evaluation of the faculty member during the probationary period, in the light of the institution's stated

criteria."[20] It would appear that in Minnesota private colleges evaluation criteria is not entirely clearly and equally perceived by administrators and faculty.

The National Commission further recommends that post secondary institutions develop "a more careful and reliable use of teaching effectiveness as a criterion for...award of tenure."[21] While administrators and chapter presidents agree that teaching competence is of the highest significance in determining tenure appointments, the means of determining teaching competence have either not been developed or are presently in the initial stages of development. (See Attachment A, question 18.) Ten administrators and one chapter president sent forms employed by faculty committees in determining teaching competence. A number of responses indicated that a statement of criteria was being developed.

In a further recommendation the National Commission suggests that in retaining tenure "a number of reforms to remove the defects and strengthen tenure policies"[22] be enacted. The Commission also proposes that colleges develop "sanctions short of dismissal...to be applied in cases of demonstrated irresponsibility or professional misconduct."[23] When asked

---

[20] Faculty Tenure, p. 59

[21] Ibid., p. 36

[22] Ibid., p. 23

[23] Ibid., pp. 76-77

whether they favored such sanctions (Attachment A, question 17), eight administrators responded that they did; four did not. Eight chapter presidents did; one did not. Certain sanctions were suggested. Those favored were:

	Administrators	Chapter Presidents
1. A reduction in salary	(7)	(8)
2. A compulsory leave to remedy certain problems	(7)	(5)
3. A remedial assignment to be taken as a sabbatical	(4)	(3)
4. A reduction in rank	(4)	(4)
5. Loss of certain course assignments	(2)	(3)

One chapter president suggested early retirement.

For those probationary faculty appointees not granted tenure, question fifteen (Attachment A) asked if there were any recourse for a reconsideration. At ten of the institutions recourse was available. In six instances recourse is to the governing board, one to the president, and four to a faculty committee.

Finally, question sixteen asked whether any tenured faculty member during the past five years had been dismissed. Of the responding administrators, one reported a dismissal (a case in which a faculty member "refused to sign his contract in hopes of negotiating a higher salary"). Of the chapter presidents, one (from an institution whose academic administrator had not responded) reported a dismissal for teaching incompetence ("connected with alchoholism"). Thus it would appear that tenured faculty at Minnesota private colleges have remained fairly secure during the past five years.

A Final Consideration

Tenure, in spite of its detractors and defects, survives as an integral part of the Minnesota private colleges. The issue for the private colleges is not, however, tenure's immediate survival. It is rather tenure "rightly understood and properly administered,"[24] a concept endorsed by the National Commission on Tenure. It is too early to evaluate the full response to the Commission's recommendations. It would appear, however, that the private colleges of Minnesota will endorse many of them.

It would also appear that given the present period of static faculty employment and given the possibility of future decline in student enrollment, college administrators and campus faculty leadership, somewhat begrudgingly, may allow the development of a new faculty employment position. This new position would offer greater job security than the probationary position. It would also offer greater flexibility than the tenured position. If such a position is developed, faculty and administrators will need to make explicitly clear its conditions and its duration. It must not become a catch-all for mediocre faculty nor a limbo for mavericks and dissenters. Since one of the alleged hallmarks of the small private college is its commitment to community, such a position would prevent the rending disruption of "up and out" tenure decisions required under a quota system. It would also avoid some of the problems posed by a tenured-in faculty.

---

[24] Faculty Tenure, p. 21

The responses to the questionnaires suggest that much careful study and implementation must be undertaken to insure that tenure is "properly administered." Such implementation will not be easy, for faculties have much at stake in tenure.

Further, tenure "rightly understood" will require an even greater effort. Academic tenure is not an inalienable faculty right. Its defense must be rigorously undertaken by the total academic community. Tenure is under heavy fire inside and outside of education. Editorial writers, business leaders, and legislators question the concept. Such challenges are heard in the allegations of Michael Scriven before a California legislative committee. "The failure of universities," Scriven charged, "which have done research on almost everything else under the sun, to study their own basic procedures with the same care shows an outstanding lack of responsibility."[25] Private college administrators and faculties of the state of Minnesota should undertake the responsibility of examining their policies and procedures for tenure appointments. They should also assume responsibility for making the rationale for these policies and procedures understood to the public at large. Only in this manner will tenure be rightly understood and properly administered.

---

[25] Education Commission of the State Legislative Review, 3:13 (April 9, 1973), p. 2.

ATTACHMENT A.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE MINNESOTA COLLEGES

1. The number of faculty at your institution having a full-time appointment and having at least a half-time teaching assignment (as of October 1972).

   _____

2. The number of the above faculty who are tenured (as of October 1972).

   _____

3. The number of tenured faculty at your institution who do not fit into the above category (as of October 1972).

   Librarians _____

   Administrators _____

   Others _____

4. Does your institution grant tenure to teaching faculty on a part-time appointment (part-time from the initial appointment)?

   Yes _____ No _____

5. Does a tenured full-time faculty who moves to a part-time appointment retain tenure at your institution?

   Yes _____ No _____

6. In the granting of tenure what is the maximum number of years that a faculty member at your institution may hold a probationary (non-tenured) appointment? (The AAUP 1940 Statement on Tenure sets the maximum number at seven years.)

   1_____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____More_____

7. What is the minimum number of years of a non-tenured appointment before the granting of tenure?

   A. For an initial appointment at the full professor rank _____

   B. For an initial appointment at the associate professor rank____

   C. For an initial appointment at the assistant professor rank____

D. For an initial appointment at the instructor rank _____

8. Is the tenure procedure at your institution clearly specified to the new faculty at the time of faculty hiring?

Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, I would appreciate a copy of your tenure policy statement with the return of this questionnaire.)

9. In the granting of tenure at your institution, who participates in the evaluation process and to what degree are their evaluations a consideration in the process? (Place a number after each participant to indicate degree of participation: 1. Of great significance 2. Of some significance 3. Of little significance 4. Of no significance.)

A. Faculty peers (interdepartmental) _____

B. Faculty peers (departmental) _____

C. Administrators:

Department Chairman _____

Divisional Chairman _____

Academic Dean _____

President _____

Others (Indicate title) _____ _____

D. Students:

Majors _____

Non-majors _____

Under classmen _____

Upper classmen _____

Others (Indicate title) _____ _____

E. Members of governing board (trustees, regents, etc.) _____

F. Outside consultants (Indicate profession or qualifications)

_____ _____

10. In the evaluation process what factors play a role and how significant is each factor in determining tenure appointment? (Respond to all categories. Please follow the response procedure of question #9.)

A. Teaching competence _____

B. Research competence _____

C. Academic degree _____

D. Publication record _____

E. Community service role _____

F. Ability to interact successfully with:

Faculty _____

Students _____

Administrators _____

G. Commitment to the goals of the college _____

H. Religious commitment _____

I. Other (Please elaborate) _____

11. As you know, the commission on academic tenure (AAUP-AAC) has advised in its preliminary report that academic institutions "Retain tenure, but ration it." In the light of this preliminary report would you favor a quota system for tenured appointments at your institution?

Yes _____ No _____

(If Yes, what percentage quota would you suggest? 50 _____

60 _____ 66 2/3 _____ 70 _____ 75 _____ 80 _____ Other _____)

(If no, do you foresee the time when your institution will be "tenured-in"--90 to 100 percent tenured? Yes _____ No _____
Do you believe a "tenured-in" faculty would pose special problems for your institution?

Yes _____ No _____

(If Yes, please indicate some of the special problems.)

12. If you favor a quota system, do you also favor the AAUP's widely accepted tenured-or-out rule?

Yes _____ No _____

13. Union College of New York, while accepting the quota system, will allow promising young faculty to continue beyond the seven-year probationary point on short-term contracts until a "tenure slot" opens. Do you favor such a "holding pattern" for your institution?

Yes _____ No _____

14. During the past three years (1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973) how many candidates have come up for tenure appointments at your institution? _____ How many of these candidates were <u>not</u> granted tenure? _____

15. If a candidate is not granted tenure at your institution, does he/she have a recourse for a reconsideration of that decision?

Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, to whom does he have recourse?

_____)

ATTACHMENT B.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE MINNESOTA PRIVATE COLLEGES

1. Is the tenure procedure at your institution clearly specified to the new faculty at the time of faculty hiring?

   Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, I would appreciate a copy of your tenure policy statement with the return of this questionnaire.)

2. In the granting of tenure at your institution, who participates in the evaluation process and to what degree are their evaluations a consideration in the process? (Place a number after each participant to indicate degree of participation: 1. Of great significance 2. Of some significance 3. Of little significance 4. Of no significance.)

   A. Faculty peers (interdepartmental) _____

   B. Faculty peers (departmental) _____

   C. Administrators:

      Department Chairman _____

      Divisional Chairman _____

   D. Academic Dean _____

      President _____

      Others (Indicate title) _____ _____

   E. Students:

      Majors _____

      Non-majors _____

      Under classmen _____

      Upper classmen _____

      Others _____ (Indicate title) _____

   F. Members of governing board (trustees, regents, etc.)_____

   G. Outside consultants (Indicate profession or qualifications)

      _____

3. In the evaluation process what factors play a role and how significant is each factor in determining tenure appointment? (Respond to all categories. Please follow the response procedure of question #2.)

   A. Teaching competence _____

   B. Research competence _____

   C. Academic degree _____

   D. Publication record _____

   E. Community service role _____

   F. Ability to interact successfully with:

      Faculty _____

      Students _____

      Administrators _____

   G. Commitment to the goals of the college _____

   H. Religious commitment _____

   I. Other (Please elaborate) _____

4. As you know, the commission on academic tenure (AAUP-AAC) has advised in its preliminary report that academic institutions "Retain tenure, but ration it." In the light of this preliminary report would you favor a quota system for tenured appointments at your institution?

   Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, what percentage quota would you suggest? 50 _____ 60 _____ 66 2/3 _____ 70 _____ 75 _____ 80 _____ Other _____) (If No, do you foresee the time when your institution will be "tenure-in" --90 to 100 percent tenured?

   Yes _____ No _____ Do you believe a tenured-in faculty would pose special problems for your institution?

   Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, please indicate some of the special problems.

5. If you favor a quota system, do you also favor the AAUP's widely accepted tenured-or-out rule?

Yes _____ No _____

6 Union College of New York, while accepting the quota system will allow promising young faculty to continue beyond the seven-year probationary point on short-term contracts until a "tenure slot" opens. Do you favor such a "holding pattern" for your institution?

Yes _____ No _____

7. During the past five years has a tenured faculty member been dismissed from your institution?

Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, what was the basis for dismissal?)

A. Financial exigency _____

B. Moral turpitude _____

C. Teaching incompetence _____

D. Other _____) (Please specify)

8. The AAUP-AAC commission on tenure recommends that in retaining tenure "a number of reforms to remove the defects and strengthen tenure policies" need to be enacted. The commission suggests "sanctions short of dismissal...to be applied in cases of demonstrated irresponsibility or professional misconduct."

Would you favor such sanctions? Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, what might some of these sanctions be? Check those you would favor.

A. A reduction in rank _____

B. A reduction in salary _____

C. A loss of some fringe benefit _____

D. A loss of certain specialty courses _____

E. A compulsory leave to remedy certain problems _____

F. A remedial assignment to be taken as a sabbatical _____

G. Others _____)

9. The AAUP-AAC commission has also proposed "a more careful and reliable use of teaching effectiveness as a criterion for promotion and award of tenure." Does your insitution presently have a statement of norms for determining teaching effectiveness?

Yes _____ No _____ (If Yes, I would appreciate a copy of such a statement--along with the tenure policy statement of question #1--with the return of this questionnaire.)